DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 800 SP 026 084

AUTHOR Brousseau, Bruce; Freeman, Donald
TITLE Entering Teacher Candidate Interviews--Fall, 1982. Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education. OPE Technical Report No. 5.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; Career Guidance; Career Planning; *Education Majors; Higher Education; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Role; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS Michigan State University

ABSTRACT

Selected students entering five alternative teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University were interviewed about their perceptions of their role as teachers. Opinions were solicited on: (1) reasons for career choice; (2) choice of program; (3) classroom rules; (4) time allocations for instructional activities; (5) allocation of time to particular subjects; (6) major responsibilities of the classroom teacher; (7) educational goals and how they may be attained; (8) subject matter knowledge; (9) teaching students to accept personal responsibilities; (10) teacher decision making; (11) meaning of "equal education"; and (12) desired image as a teacher. Responses to these questions are presented on tables with brief narrative analyses. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257800

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Brousseau

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education

OPE Technical Report No. 5

ENTERING TEACHER CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS - FALL, 1982

Bruce Brousseau & Donald Freeman

Department of Teacher Education
and
Office of Program Evaluation

026084

Publication of . . .

The Office of Program Evaluation
College of Education
Michigan State University

June, 1984

OPE Technical Report No. 5

ENTERING TEACHER CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS - FALL, 1982

Bruce Brousseau & Donald Freeman

Office of Program Evaluation Technical Report #5 (1984)
Entering Teacher Candidate Interviews, Fall, 1982

In order to describe how candidates entering MSU's teacher preparation programs perceive their role as teachers, five to six students from each of the five alternative programs were interviewed fall term, 1982. With the exception of the Standard program, interviews were conducted by the program evaluator for the candidate's program. [Students from the Standard program were interviewed by various individuals in the Office of Program Evaluation.] This report focuses on the results of those interviews.

A system for classifying responses to each interview question was developed by the Undergraduate Program Evaluation Committee (UPEC). A copy of these interview scales is provided in the Appendix. This classification system represents the UPEC's attempt to provide meaningful descriptions of student responses across some, but not all, of the interviews considered in this report. One of the primary purposes of this investigation was to test the success of the scales in capturing the full range of responses across a larger number of interviews.

Prior to describing the results, some limitations of the data should be made explicit. First, all responses were initially summarized by only one evaluator (i.e., there was no check on reliability as it relates to assigning answers to categories). Second, this information was collected by seven different interviewers. Even though the interviewers were all guided by the same interview schedule, there is good reason to believe that differences in interviewer "style" may have had a differential

BEST COPY

influence on some responses. Finally, all interviews were not conducted at the same time during the term. Therefore, students in some programs had more exposure to eduational issues in TE 200 than was true for students in other programs. Although results will be described for each program in the series of table that follow, it is important to recognize that the second and third limitations, coupled with the small sample size, preclude meaningful across-program comparisons. Therefore, summary statements in this report will focus on the total sample.

Table 1 describes the distribution of interviewees by program affiliation.

Insert Table 1 about here

Results

(1A) Why Teaching?

Table 2 describes the pattern of responses to question 1(A), "Why did you decide to become a classroom teacher?" As these results indicate, respondents were generally more likely to describe personal sources of motivation than to talk about the opportunity to promote student outcomes through teaching. For example, 14 of the 28 participants indicated that one or more personal motives (category #6) attracted them to teaching (e.g., positive memories of previous school experiences or liking to work with children). On the other hand, none of the 28 entering teacher candidates said they wanted to become teachers because teaching would provide an opportunity to promote academic achievement (category #2) or to enhance the cognitive development (category #3) of students. It is also interesting to note that six candidates were not sure why they

BEST COPY

wanted to become teachers and nine others indicated that the opportunity to promote social causes inflenced their decision to pursue a career in teaching (category #1).

Insert Table 2 about here

No scale was developed for the question, "What other careers have you considered? However, as shown in Table 3, teacher candidates at MSU have considered a variety of other careers. Counting only the first answer given, nursing and physical therapist were the most common responses. The majority of other answers also seemed to represent what could be labeled "people oriented" or "helping" professions.

Insert Table 3 about here

(1B) Rewards in Teaching Other Jobs Don't Offer?

Table 4 describes the pattern of responses to question 1(B), "Are there rewards in teaching that other jobs do not usually offer?" As these data indicate, the overwhelming majority of responses focused on sources of personal satisfaction such as the opportunity to work with young people or to help someone learn. Only 4 of the 28 respondents cited job-related characteristics such having the summers off or the level of autonomy teachers enjoy.

Insert Table 4 about here

(1C) Disadvantages of Teaching?

When asked, "What are some disadvantages of teaching?," there was a noticeable shift in response patterns (see Table 5). Nine of the 25

BEST COPY

candidates who were asked to respond to this question cited disadvantages of the role itself (e.g., low salaries; low status/prestige). Nevertheless, a majority cited personal difficulties/frustrations in carrying out the role (e.g., "constantly being a model..."; "can't use your own ideas because of pressures from outside forces").

Insert Table 5 about here

(1D) Reaction of Others to Career Plans?

The pattern of responses to question 1(D), "What do others like your parents or close friends think of your current career plans?" indicate that parents and close friends were usually supportive or highly supportive of the candidate's decision to pursue a career in teaching (see Table 6). Only 10 of the 23 candidates who responded to this question indicated that these individuals had mixed feelings (n=9) or were nonsupportive of their decision (n=1). Whereas the mixed emotions of parents revolved around low pay and a negative employment picture, close friends emphasized low prestige (e.g., "they think teaching is a 'blow-off' major"). Supportive comments were similar across parents and friends and usually referred to the candidate's personal feelings about teaching as a profession (e.g., "once they understood how happy I will be teaching, they were very supportive").

Insert Table 6 about here

(2) Reasons for Selecting Pilot Program?

Data summarized in Table 7 indicates that, for the most part, candidates had a fairly well informed basis for chosing one pilot program

BEST COPY

in preference to the others. Eleven of the 28 candidates were knowledgable of the goals of their own program; nine were also familiar with the goals of at least one other program. However, there is at least some reason to believe that these results were influenced by a relatively high level of probing on this question. Although one must be cautious in interpreting results from such a small sample, it is interesting to note that three of the six candidates in the standard program seemed to be unaware of the existence of the pilot programs and the other three candidates selected the standard program because of problems in scheduling courses in the pilot programs.

Insert Table 7 about here

(3) Classroom Rules?

Responses to question 3, "What rules, if any, will you have in your classroom?" were classified on three different scales - the source of the rules, the rule's content, and whether or not candidates stated that they would like to have a minimum number of rules. As shown in Table 8, 19 of the 34 responses that were classified for this question implied that the teacher would be the primary source of classroom rules; only five indicated that rules/expecations would be negotiated with students and four implied that classroom rules would result from school or district policies. Six of the 28 candidates had trouble citing well formulated rules (e.g., "can't think of formal set of rules..."; "I'll know they'll know...something I have to decide yet"; "Safety...I'm not hung up on individual picky-type rules"). Most of the 28 rules that were cited would benefit the student or both the student and the teacher. Eight of the 28

BEST COPY

teacher candidates indicated that they would like to have a minimum number of classroom rules.

Insert Table 8 about here

(4A) Estimates of Time Allocations for Instructional Activities

Table 9 (a-e) describes the percent of classroom time each candidate expects to devote to (1) whole-group teacher directed activities, (2) working with small groups, (3) working with individuals, and (4) other teaching tasks. Estimates of time devoted to whole-group instruction ranged from 15% to 65%, with a mean of 35.5%. Estimated percentages of time allocated to working with small groups ranged from 5% to 50%, with a mean of 28.8%. The corresponding range for working with individuals was from 5% to 60%, with a mean of 26.8%. The mean percentage of time for other teaching tasks was 9.6%.

Insert Table 9 about here

(4B) Why More Time Devoted to Highest Rated Activity?

When the activity for which the most time was allocated was identified by the interviewer and the candidate was asked, "Why was the most time allocated to this mode of instruction?," 13 of the 28 candidates defended their time allocations in terms of the perceived needs or interests of students (e.g., students will be bored if I lecture too much). As shown in Table 10, five students talked about their own preferred learning styles and four others made some reference to an institutional or context related factor.

BEST COPY

Insert Table 10 about here

4D) Confidence in Estimates?

When asked, "How confident are you that these estimates will provide reasonably accurate portrayal of how time will actually be allocated to ifferent instructional activities in your classroom?," 21 of the 28 andidates (75%) expressed a moderate to high level of confidence in heir estimates (see Table 11). In other words, only one-fourth of the ntering teacher candidates who were interviewed had serious reservations bout the accuracy of their estimates.

Insert Table 11 about here

4C) How Students Will Be Assigned to Small Groups

Most answers to the question, "How would students be assigned to mall groups?," implied that the candidate would form heterogenous groups ased upon academic (39%) or social/personality (21%) considerations (see able 12). However, 21% of responses implied that the candidate would use ome form of random assignment to groups.

Insert Table 12 about here

Several participants indicated that grouping strategies will depend n an understanding of their students and their patterns of interaction which takes time to develop." Some candidates also noted negative ffects of grouping (e.g., "Want to avoid labeling good-group and low-group"; "Not Sure...Don't want to label or stereotype").

5A) Estimated Time Allocations to Subject Areas

BEST COPY

Elementary education candidates were asked to estimate the percent of time they would allocate during the course of a week to each of the following content areas: art, language arts, math, music, physical education, reading, science, and social studies. As Table 13 shows, this group of entering teacher candidates allocated most instructional time to the "core" subjects - language arts, reading, math, social studies and science. It is interesting to note, however, that the mean percentage of time allocated to these five subjects was very nearly equal. In other words, estimated time allocations to subject areas among entering teacher candidates do not reflect the level of variation that is likely to occur when teachers adhere to time allocations mandated by their districts (e.g., most districts call for elementary school teachers to spend far more time on reading than on math).

Insert Table 13 about here

(5B) Why Smallest Allocation of Time to Particular Subject?

Table 14 provides a summary of responses to the question, "Why would you allocate less time to (relevant subject area) than to any other subject?" As these data indicate, nearly two-thirds of the responses (63%) focused on the lack of "intrinsic value" of this subject matter area (e.g., it is more important for students to learn to read than to learn to do art). Other participants indicated that these subjects were important, but not important enough to demand large allocations of in-class time (e.g., "...you can pursue those three outside of class on your own time"; "I think it (P.E.) can be done at recess..."). Four of the 19 responses centered on the candidate's self-perceptions or what

BEST COPY

ey believed had been most important or most interesting for they, e..selves to learn.

Insert Table 14 about here

5C) Level of Confidence in Estimates?

Responses to the question, "How confident are you that these timates will provide a reasonably accurate portrayal of how time will tually be allocated to different instructional activities in your assroom?" were varied. As shown in Table 15, six of the 14 candidates o answered this question conveyed high levels of confidence in their timates, three candidates suggested that they have a moderate level of nfidence and five indicated that they have low levels of confidence in eir estimates.

Insert Table 15 about here

) Major Responsibilities of a Classroom Teacher?

Table 16 provides a summary of responses to the question, "What are e major responsibilities of a classroom teacher?" As these data dicate, entering teacher candidates were most likely to talk about the ed for teachers to promote personal/psychological/social growth of udents.

Insert Table 16 about here

A) Candidate's Own Primary Goal in Teaching?

When the discussion shifted from responsiblities of teachers in neral to the question, "How would you describe your primary goal as a

BEST COPY

classroom teacher?," candidates were less likely to talk about promoting personal growth and somewhat more likely to talk about enhancing academic achievement (see Table 17). This shift seems to indicate that entering teacher candidates are more likely to view the goal of promoting personal growth as something teachers are expected to do than as the goal they personally consider to be most important.

Insert Table 17 about here

(7B) How Attainment of Goal Will Be Assessed

Responses to the question, "How will you know whether or not you have achieved this goal?" are summarized in Table 18. Although answers were most likely to focus on observations or other ongoing interactions with students, seven of the 28 candidates indicated that they would look to both formal (e.g., tests) and informal (e.g., observations) sources of information when making these judgements. At the other extreme, five candidates had no idea how they could determine if they had achieved their primary goal or made no reference to sources of information when answering the question.

Insert Table 18 about here

(9) Subject Matter Knowledge

Classifications summarized in Table 19 indicate that most entering candidates have not given much consideration to the question, "What is it a teacher needs to understand about a subject matter to teach it effectively?" More than one-half of the 28 participants talked only about the need to know the subject itself (categories 5A & 5B); they did not

BEST COPY

consider the need to understand the basic nature of the subject, how children come to understand the subject, or relationships to other disciplines. Examples included: "you need to know alot" and "you really have to know what you're doing."

Insert Table 19 about here

(9) Teaching Youngsters to Accept Personal Responsibilities

Table 20 provides a summary of responses to the question, "How can teachers create an environment in which their students actively take responsibility for themselves and others in their group?" As this summary indicates, none of the 30 responses that were classified focused on the need to insure that students had requisite knowledge or understanding. Six responses centered on the need to enhance individual self-concepts (e.g., get students to feel their own ideas are important) and nine recognized that teachers might facilitate personal responsibilites by establishing a classroom climate/environment where students must accept personal and social responsiblities (category d). All the other answers dealt with instructional techniques - either specific management techniques (category ci) or more general teaching strategies (category cii).

Insert Table 20 about here

(10) Teacher Decision Making

A common response to the question, "When making difficult classroom decisions, what should teachers consider?" was "decisions about what?" Given this ambiguity, the Undergraduate Program Evaluation Committee was

BEST COPY

not able to develop an acceptable scale for classifying responses to question 10. Nevertheless, the responses of each of the 28 entering candidates who were interviewed are briefly summarized in Table 21.

Insert Table 21 about here

(11) Meaning of the Phrase 'Equal Educational Opportunity'?

Question 11 asked, "What does the phrase 'equal educational opportunity' mean to you in the context of a classroom? Data summarized in Table 22 indicates that about two-thirds of the 28 entering teacher candidates interpreted the phrase "equal educational opportunity" in terms of equal inputs or equal opportunities to learn. However, two of the candidates interpreted the phrase in terms of equal outcomes and seven others responded in a way that suggests they have some sense of the complexity of the equity issue (categories 4 or 5).

Insert Table 22 about here

(12) Desired Image as a Teacher?

The final interview question asked, "How do you hope your students will describe you as a teacher?" Answers are summarized in Table 23. As these data indicate, more than one-half of the 40 responses that were classified dealt with the candidate's self-image - 18 responses focused on the desire to be seen as approachable or supportive and five centered on the desire to be viewed as competent. On the other hand, one-fifth of the responses conveyed the candidate's desire to be recognized for his or her ability to promote academic achievement.

Insert Table 23 about here

BEST COPY

Table 1

Fall 1982 Interview Sampling Distribution:

PROGRAM	NUMBER OF ETCs INTERVIEWED
Academic Learning	5
Heterogeneous Classrooms	6
Learning Communities	5
Multiple Perspectives	6
Standard Program	6
TOTAL	28

Table 2

Question 1(A): Why did you decide to become a classroom teacher?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

Program:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
AL	2					1	1	1	
HC	2				1	3	1		3
LC	2			2		5		1	2
MP	2				1	2		1	
SP	1					3	1	1	1
Total N = 40	9	0	0	2	2	14	3	4	6

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 3

Question : What other careers have you considered?

(a) Academic Learning:
physical therapy, nursing
physical therapy, lawyer
psychology and English major
pre med., computer science
ministry, chemistry, medicine

(b) Heterogeneous Classrooms:
business
law school
social work, psychology
audiology and speech, social work, psychology
nothing else seriously
none

(c) Learning Communities:
nursing, counseling
nursing
counseling, psychology
psychology oriented
physical therapy, nursing

(d) Multiple Perspectives:
secretarial, accounting
political science, politics, telecommunications
computer science, engineering
studio art
theater
secretary, insurance, sales person

(e) Standard Program:
pre med., pediatrician
military, engineering, farming, agriculture
marketing
business ed., secretarial
nursing, natural resources, journalism
working with the German and U.S. government for a better understanding between the two.

Table 4

Question 1(B): Are there rewards in teaching that other jobs do not usually offer?

Program:	PERSONAL SATISFACTION	JOB RELATED CHARACTERISTICS	NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES	
AL	4	3		
HC	5		2	
LC	4	1		
MP	6			
SP	5			
Total	24	4	2	N = 30

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 5

Question 1(C): What are some of the disadvantages of teaching?

Program:	DIFFICULTIES FRUSTRATIONS	CHARACTERISTIC OF THE ROLE ITSELF	NEVER THOUGHT ABOUT IT	
AL	3	2		
HC	3		2	
LC	1	1		
MP	5	1		
SP	2	5		
Total	14	9	2	N = 25

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 6

Question 1(D): What do others like your parents of close friends think of your current career plans?

Program:	HIGHLY SUPPORTIVE	SUPPORTIVE	NEUTRAL/ MIXED	NON-SUPPORTIVE	OPPOSED
AL	1	1	2		
HC	1	1	3	1	
LC	2	3			
MP	2	1	2		
SP		1	2		
Total N = 23	6	7	9	1	0

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 7

Question 2: Why did you choose the pilot teacher education program you are in?

Program:	GOALS 2 PROGRAMS	GOALS OWN PROGRAM	PROGRAM STRUCTURE	PERSONAL ADVANTAGES	INTERPERS FACTORS	UNINFORMED DECISION
AL	2	1	1	1	2	
HC	2	4	3	2		
LC	2	4				
MP	3	2	3		1	
SP				3		3
Total N = 39	9	11	7	6	3	3

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 8

Question 3: What rules, if any, will you have in your classroom?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	A. SOURCE							B. CONTENT					C. NUMBER	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	YES	NO
AL	1	1				2	1	1	1	2		2	1	4
HC	1	2	5					2	1	2	1		4	2
LC			2	4		1		2		3			1	3
MP	1		5			2		1½		1	½	2	1	5
SP	1		4	1						2		4	2	4
Total	4	3	16	5		5	1	6½	2	10	1½	8	8	18
			N = 34							N = 28			N = 26	

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 9

Question 4: Please read this card carefully and then estimate the percent of classroom time you expect to devote to each activity.

(a) Academic Learning:

ETC:	WHOLE-GROUP ACTIVITIES	WORK WITH SMALL GROUPS	WORKING W/ INDIVIDUALS	OTHER TEACHING TASKS
A	15	30	50	5
B	20	50	20	10
C	55	20	20	5
D	60	5	34	1
E	60	20	15	5
Mean	42	25	27.8	5.2

Table 9 (cont.)

(b) Heterogeneous Classrooms:

	WHOLE-GROUP ACTIVITIES	WORK WITH SMALL-GROUPS	WORKING W/ INDIVIDUALS	OTHER TEACHING TASKS
ETC:				
A	20	30	40	10
B	20	30	40	10
C	25	50	15	10
D	30	30	40	1
E	30	40	25	5
F	30	30	30	10
Mean	25.8	35	31.7	7.7

(c) Learning Community:

	WHOLE-GROUP ACTIVITIES	WORK WITH SMALL-GROUPS	WORKING W/ INDIVIDUALS	OTHER TEACHING TASKS
ETC:				
A	25	40	25	10
B	30	25	35	10
C	30	30	20	20
D	30	45	20	5
E	35	30	20	20
Mean	30	34	24	13

(d) Multiple Perspectives:

	WHOLE-GROUP ACTIVITIES	WORK WITH SMALL-GROUPS	WORKING W/ INDIVIDUALS	OTHER TEACHING TASKS
ETC:				
A	25	25	30	20
B	30	30	20	20
C	35	35	20	10
D	50	20	20	10
E	65	10	25	3
F	50	20	20	10
Mean	42.5	23.3	22.5	12.2

Table 9 (cont.)

Percent of classroom time you expect to devote to each activity.

(e) Standard Program:

	WHOLE-GROUP ACTIVITIES	WORK WITH SMALL-GROUPS	WORKING W/ INDIVIDUALS	OTHER TEACHING TASKS
ETC:				
A	10	15	60	15
B	30	30	30	10
C	35	25	25	15
D	50	40	5	5
E	60	15	20	5
F	--	--	--	--
Mean	37	25	28	10

(f) ALL Programs:

	WHOLE-GROUP ACTIVITIES	WORK WITH SMALL-GROUPS	WORKING W/ INDIVIDUALS	OTHER TEACHING TASKS
AL	42.0	25.0	27.8	5.2
HC	25.8	35.0	31.7	7.7
LC	30.0	34.0	24.0	13.0
MP	42.5	23.3	22.5	12.2
SP	37.0	25.0	28.0	10.0
Mean	35.4	28.8	26.8	9.6

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 10

Question 4(B): Why was most time allocated to this instructional mode?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
AL		1		2	2		
HC	1		2	2	1	1	
LC	1	1		1	1		
MP				5		1	
SP	2			3	1		
Total	4	2	2	13	5	2	N = 28

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 11

Question 4(D): Level of confidence in estimate?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
AL	1		2	1		1	
HC	1			3	1	1	
LC	1		1	1	1	1	
MP			1	3	1	1	
SP	4	1		1			
Total	7	1	4	9	3	4	N = 28

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 12

Question 4(C): How would students be assigned to small groups?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
AL			1			1	4	
HC			6		5			
LC	1		3				1	
MP		1	2			1	2	
SP	1	1	1		2			
Total	2	2	13	0	7	2	7	N = 33

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 13

Question 5: During the course of a week, what percent of the time spent in content area instruction will you allocate to each of the following areas?

(a) Academic Learning:

ETC:	ART	LANGUAGE ARTS	MATH	MUSIC	P. E.	READING	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES
A	7	15	15	8	10	15	15	15
B	10	15	10	10	15	15	20	15
Mean	8.5	15	12.5	9	12.5	15	17.5	15

(b) Heterogeneous Classrooms:

ETC:	ART	LANGUAGE ARTS	MATH	MUSIC	P. E.	READING	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES
A	5	20	15	5	5	20	10	5
B	5	10	25	5	10	25	10	10
C	5	20	15	5	5	20	20	10
D	5	10	30	5	5	35	5	5
E	15	15	15	10	10	15	15	15
F	2	16	20	2	5	25	15	15
Mean	6.2	15.2	20	5.3	6.7	23.3	12.5	10

Table 13 (cont.)

Percent of time spent in content areas:

(c) Learning Communities:

ETC:	ART	LANGUAGE ARTS	MATH	MUSIC	P. E.	READING	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES
A	3	10	20	3	10	5	30	20
B	5	10	20	5	5	20	15	20
C	5	15	20	5	5	10	10	20
D	5	15	15	5	5	20	15	20
E	5	15	15	5	5	20	15	20
Mean	4.6	13	18	4.6	6	15	17	20

NOTE: Respondent A said she plans to incorporate READING into other subjects.

(d) Multiple Perspectives:

ETC:	ART	LANGUAGE ARTS	MATH	MUSIC	P. E.	READING	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES
A	5	10	10	5	5	10	10	10
B	5	15	15	5	5	20	10	15
C	5	1[illegible]	20	5	5	20	15	10
D	10	20	20	10	5	20	20	1[illegible]
E	10	20	20	10	10	20	20	20
F	10	30	20	10	10	30	20	20
Mean	7.5	17.5	17.5	7.5	6.7	20	15.8	15

NOTE: The total percentages range from a low of 65% for respondent A to a high of 150% for respondent F.

Table 13 (cont.)

Percent of time spent in content areas:

(e) ALL Elementary Education Programs Combined:

	ART	LANGUAGE ARTS	MATH	MUSIC	P. E.	READING	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES
AL	8.5	15.0	12.5	9.0	12.5	15.0	17.5	15.0
HC	6.2	15.2	20.0	5.3	6.7	23.3	12.5	10.0
LC	4.6	13.0	18.0	4.6	6.0	15.0	17.0	20.0
MP	7.5	17.5	17.5	7.5	6.7	20.0	15.8	15.0
Mean	6.4	15.3	17.9	6.2	7.1	19.2	15.3	14.7

Table 14

Question 5(B): Why smallest allocation to particular subject?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
AL			1		1	1	
HC			2		2		
LC	1	2	3		1		
MP			6				
SP			1		1		
Total	1	2	13	0	5	1	N = 22

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 15

Question 5(C): Level of confidence in estimate?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
AL	1				1		
HC	1	1	1			1	
LC					2		
MP	2		1	1	1	1	
SP	1	1					
Total	5	2	2	1	4	2	N = 16

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 16

Question 6: What are the major responsibilities of a classroom teacher?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
AL	3	3	1	2		2		
HC	2		2	1	2	4		
LC	2	2	1	3		2		
MP	1	2	1	2		2		
SP		2	1		2	5		
Total	8	9	6	8	4	15	0	N = 50

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 17

Question 7(A): How would you describe your primary goal as a teacher?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
AL		2		3				
HC			1	2	1	2	2	
LC	1			2	1	3	1	
MP	1			4		1		
SP				1	3	2		
Total	2	2	1	12	5	8	3	N = 33

Table 18

Question 7(B): How would you know whether you have achieved this goal?

	NO IDEA	THROUGH OBSERVATIONS	THROUGH TESTING	BOTH METHODS	
AL	1	1	1	2	
HC	1	4	1		
LC	2	3			
MP	1		3	2	
SP		2	1	3	
Total	5	10	6	7	N = 28

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 19

Question 8: What is it a teacher needs to know about a subject matter to teach it effectively?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5A)	(5B)	
AL					5		
HC		1	2		3		
LC	2		1		2		
MP		1			2	3	
SP			3	1	2		
Total	2	2	6	1	14	3	N = 28

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 20

Question 9: How can teachers create an environment in which their students actively take responsibility for themselves and others in their group?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(a)	(b)	(ci)	(cii)	(d)	
AL			1	3	1	
HC		1	1	2	3	
LC		1	1	1	2	
MP		3	2	1		
SP		1	1	2	3	
Total	0	6	6	9	9	N = 30

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 21

Question 10: When making difficult classroom decisions, what should teachers consider?

No scale was developed for this item but portions of the responses are listed below:

(a) Academic Learning responses:
"why are they causing a disturbance?"
"Be as fair as you can."
"Student ability"
"Decisions about what?"

(b) Heterogeneous Classrooms responses:
"fairness, objectivity"
"consistency, be a consistent teacher"
"you should think of the student - that's what you're there for."
"academic level, home background, personality of the child."
"what's best for the student."

(c) Learning Communities responses:
(I get some sense that its based on feelings)
"I think using my own judgment is very important."
"want to be as objective as possible."
"Need to know a lot about the background of your students."

(d) Multiple Perspectives responses:
"look at a lot of different information."
"Depends on the situation . . . don't be impulsive."
"What information is available, what has worked in the past?"
"Will it affect the child . . . What might happen in the future. Depends on the problem."
"Think about what happened . . . how can I accomplish what I want."

Table 21 (cont.)

(e) Standard Program responses:
"I would ask another teacher."
(refers to a situation requiring discipline)
"Consider maybe all of the possible outcomes."
"My first consideration would be the student."
(general and "complete" answer)
(general and "complete" answer)

Table 22

Question 11: What does the phrase equal educational opportunity mean to you in the context of a classroom?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
AI		2	2	1		
HC		2		2	2	
LC		4		1		
MP		6				
SP	1	4		1		
Total	1	18	2	5	2	N = 28

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.

Table 23

Question 12: How do you hope your students will describe you as a teacher?

The following table represents the frequency distribution for each response category by program.

	(1A)	(1B)	(2)	(3A)	(3B)	
AL	2	1	2	3		
HC	1	6		1	1	
LC		5	2		1	
MP	2			2	1	
SP		6	1	2	1	
Total	5	18	5	8	4	N = 40

see Appendix B (Interview Scales) for complete description of categories.